

To: Government Administration and Elections Committee

As I am unable to testify via Zoom, I am writing to express my opposition to S.J. No. 30 (COMM)  
**RESOLUTION PROPOSING A STATE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO RECOGNIZE A  
RIGHT OF PERSONAL REPRODUCTIVE AUTONOMY AND FREEDOM.**

This language is extremely vague, and if passed would undoubtedly be used to enshrine an unlimited "right" to abortion in our State Constitution – just as the phrase "reproductive freedom" has been used by certain United Nations groups to pressure nations into legalizing abortion. It needs to be made clear that "personal autonomy" doesn't include giving a pregnant woman a license to kill the unborn child who is temporarily living in her womb. If a woman doesn't want to nurture a child, she needs to exercise her "autonomy" by not conceiving one.

Basic biology tells that the unborn child is a member of our species, a fellow human being who receives a full genetic identity at conception and needs only time and nourishment to grow and develop as the person s/he already is. We pro-lifers know that *both* mother and child are persons, and do our best to help them both (efforts that, contrary to pro-abortion propaganda, don't end at birth). It's the pro-abortion crowd who deny science by pretending that the child isn't one.

Abortion also degrades the medical profession by trying to transform doctors, nurses, and other medical workers from healers who value all human lives into killers who snuff out lives on request. Pregnancy is not a disease, and abortion is not "health care."

Viability - defined as ability to survive *outside* the womb - was the principal argument used by Justice Harry Blackmun, the author of Roe. v. Wade, to justify giving the pregnant woman the power of life and death over her unborn child. By his twisted logic, the fact that the child isn't yet viable outside the womb somehow makes it OK to rip it out of the womb, its natural habitat in which it *is* viable, and thus render it non-viable.

Using viability to judge who should have the right to live is also dangerous, since many born people - infants, children, the elderly, the sick, the handicapped - are non-viable without the help and care of others. It's not surprising that legalizing abortion has spawned a "quality of life" ethic that has put many of their lives at risk also. Do we really want this for our state?

A woman's choice to abort isn't just about her "reproductive autonomy and freedom," because it adversely affects others. Beyond the obvious victim, the unborn child whose life is snuffed out, it affects the child's father, grandparents, siblings - and society as a whole which is degraded by the denial of the child's most basic human rights. Last but not least, it affects the mother, who kills a part of herself - often under pressure from those who should be supporting her and her child - and then finds that abortion not only hasn't solved her problems, but has caused many new ones. Don't Connecticut women deserve better?

It is deplorable that pro-abortion groups are already planning to turn our state into an abortion "mecca." To rewrite our state's Constitution to allow some human beings to kill others would be an even bigger blot on Connecticut's history than our massacres of Native Americans and our toleration of slavery.

Sincerely yours,

Anne G. Burns  
60 Valleywood Road  
Cos Cob, CT 06807  
203-869-0284